

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

Wright State University Alternative Newspaper
Collection

University Archives

1-17-1969

Wright State University Alternative Newspaper: Tucson-2, Vol. 1, No. 2, 17 January 1969

Wright State University Student Body

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/alternative_newspapers



Part of the [History Commons](#), and the [Mass Communication Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Wright State University Student Body (1969). *Wright State University Alternative Newspaper: Tucson-2, Vol. 1, No. 2, 17 January 1969*. : University Archives; Wright State University Libraries .

This Newsletter is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wright State University Alternative Newspaper Collection by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

TUCSON-2

Vol. 1, No. 2, 17 January 1969

A ROAD BY ANY OTHER NAME?

Unknown to most WSU students, our Code group has named their propaganda pamphlet, Phoenix. While another tribute to this legendary bird is perhaps well meant, it is to say the least, somewhat hackneyed. With Phoenix, Arizona, and Phenix, Alabama why does Code feel it necessary to jump on the Phoenix bandwagon?

Several alternative proposals have been made, but none that can be printed in a publication such as this which is read by the entire family. We're sure each of you has coined your own name for this pamphlet. We trust the name you have chosen properly expresses the ideals of Phoenix.

TUCSON OPINION

The disgusted student body was recently offered the opportunity of reading another issue of Phoenix (1/27/69).

Of the 30 to 40 students who read this propaganda pamphlet, most finished, thinking that "it was a farce". Perhaps they were right when they were offered such statements of acute understanding of campus affairs as

"It was not, and has never been, our intention to challenge the integrity of Dr. Cox or any other member of the Academic Council Steering Committee."

(integrity - the quality or state of being of sound moral principle, uprightness, honesty, and sincerity, Syn. honesty)

This previous statement was one of several which seemed to negate the intelligence of the Code group. For example, another article in the same issue describes an Academic Council Committee, whose members were recommended by the Steering Committee, as "...a pro-administration biased committee." Of course this should not be considered a slap at the integrity of Dr. Cox who said, "As chairman of the Steering Committee, I assume a major share of the responsibility for the selection of the ...Committee." Nor should the "biased committee" remark be considered a slap at the integrity of the Academic Council even though Dr. Cox points out that "...the full membership of the committee ...was approved by the Academic Council."

To further make their point, Code replied to Dr. Cox's letter with

a statement which said that the committee "...could only return a report that was pro-administration." Could an honest man appoint such a committee? Could men of integrity on the Wright State Chapter of the AAUP recommend that such a committee consider an important problem?

Other remarks in Phoenix show the sincerity of the apology to Dr. Cox. For example:

"Most of the faculty sat the fight out, being as how most of them don't care about a Real Education, an Open University, much less Justice."

"This committee is an administration hack!"

"...cover-up for some very vicious and repressive actions on the part of Golding and his hacks - and if you don't believe it, go to an Academic Council meeting."

No one on the TUCSON staff has heard a Phoenix or Code explanation of these inconsistencies. You can't have it both ways, fellas. Either your apology is sincere or you believe the Steering Committee lacks integrity. Which is it?

NEW "GUARDIAN" CONFESSION

"The Guardian will not in the future be guilty of restricting itself to sensationalistic and biased reporting."

NEW "GUARDIAN" POLICY

"The Guardian is pledged as a newspaper to provide the WSU students with the news and the student can then draw his own conclusions." Published in the same issue, "The Faculty Subcommittee on Student Affairs met on..... As was to be expected, nothing was accomplished." A wonderful example of the new unbiased news policy.

WEEKLY QUIZ

Who said, "Wright State has a mandate to be different."?

Who was reported to have told the WSU Trustees that, "...the S & E Division faculty have increased their output of research papers."?

See the difference. Color it sad.

QUOTE OF THE WEEK

Student: "You've got to educate the faculty."
President G.: "God bless you".

DR. CHARLES E. WALES TEACHES
AT UNIVERSITY X, WHERE HE IS A HERO
TO THINKING STUDENTS.

IN DECEMBER HE WAS ELECTED PRES-
IDENT OF A NATIONAL STUDENT ORGANIZA-
TION. THIS IS THE SECOND POSITION OF
THIS TYPE HE HAS HELD.

DURING HIS TEACHING CAREER, DR.
WALES HAS TAKEN UP MANY STUDENT
CAUSES AND SPOKEN OUT AGAINST BOTH
THE FACULTY AND THE ADMINISTRATION.
IN THIS INTERVIEW HE TELLS STAFF
WRITER, HARVEY HANSON, ABOUT SOME
OF THE THINGS THAT MAKE TODAY'S
STUDENTS TICK.

ANY RESEMBLANCE BETWEEN THIS INTER-
VIEW AND ANY OTHER INTERVIEW IN THE
DAYTON DAILY NEWS (12/8/68) IS
PURELY COINCIDENTAL.

STUDENTS' AIM: 'A MEANINGFUL LIFE'

Q. It appears that a growing number
of students at University X are highly
discontented with the administration.
Is it likely there will be a student
riot as we've seen at Columbia and
San Francisco State?

A. No, I don't think so. University X
students are much more intelligent
than the others you mentioned. The
students discovered early that some
faculty had been misleading them into
attacks on the administration to cover
the real oppressors at the University
who are the faculty themselves.

A good example of the way in which
the students are misled occurred rec-
ently. It was an article in the Janu-
ary 13, Phoenix. To begin the confu-
sion, this issue was dated 1968. Actu-
ally, it was distributed in 1969. The
article itself was a tear-jerking
story about a student who got an F on
his fall quarter grade report. Upon
checking, he found that the F appeared
on his report card automatically be-
cause his teacher "...had forgotten to
send in his grade, a human enough er-
ror..."

After excusing the teacher's error,
this student castigated the registrar's
office because they didn't "get on the
stick and find out just what gives,
what's going on." The article went on
to ask "...why should it be the stu-
dent's responsibility to unravel such
administrative blunders."

Notice how cleverly the student
switched the responsibility for his
problem from the faculty (human error)
to the administration (blunder). Of
course, what the article didn't say
was that the policy of giving an auto-
matic F when no grade is turned in was
established by the faculty. The admin-
istration, in this case, was only fol-
lowing faculty orders. This policy was
fought last year but the faculty in-
sisted this is what they want the
registrar's office to do.

Q. Do the dissenting University X
students have some legitimate beefs?

A. Yes, I think they do. I think by
and large that most of the students
around the country who are dissent-
ing have some legitimate grievances.
In the cases where it has come down
to actual demonstrations it has been
largely because the faculty ignore
the needs and ideas of the students.

Q. What are some of these griev-
ances?

A. According to educational leaders
such as Robert Hutchens, E.H. Levi,
and Jacques Barzun, the underlying
cause of the trouble is the fact
that some university faculty are too
busy doing everything except teach-
ing. Students feel they have lost
their identity, that they are not
treated as human beings, that in-
struction is, at best, descriptive,
that content is encyclopedic and
what they are getting is not an
education.

Today's student wants a meaning-
ful challenge, not just the challenge
of memorizing endless facts about a
variety of disciplines. Some faculty
have convinced students that a mean-
ingful challenge must occur outside
the classroom. This generally takes
the form of a "get the administra-
tion" battle cry. In fact, the mean-
ingful challenge should occur in the
classroom, as it once did.

Q. If the faculty are not teaching,
what are they doing?

A. Some spend all their time chal-
lenging the administration. Others
are busy with their research work.
A few members of the faculty have
been outspoken about the amount of
time and money spent on this research.
One said, "I know I'm putting my neck
on the line, but it doesn't matter,
I've got to stand up for what is
right." One piece of research equip-
ment alone cost \$50,000.

The students see a great deal
of money being spent this way and
they feel it could better be spent
on other things - scholarships, for
example, or books for the library.
The students also object to the
fancy faculty offices. Two orange
crates and a board would do just
as well as the fancy desks the fac-
ulty have. And they certainly don't
need individual telephones. Six or
seven should share one phone. Be-
sides that, the soccer team needs a
dressing room and some people be-
lieve the faculty should move out
to the two empty farmhouses on camp-
us to make room for the team.

Q. What percentage of students on
campus are actively opposing the
faculty?

A. It's very difficult to estimate. Taking an estimate from the classes I teach, I would say that it's close to 80 per cent-if you can judge by the interest you see from questions. But as far as the percentage of those on campus who are taking an active part, I'd say this is about 15 or 20 per cent.

This is the way it usually is. There's usually a much smaller number of people who take part in active groups designed to institute organized change. Then you have large numbers who follow...who are sympathetic, so to speak.

Q. Is there a chapter of SDS on campus?

A. No, we have a better organization, CODE, the Committee on Deceptive Exorbitance.

This group is working very closely with the Uncle Toms on the faculty to create a noisy, diversionary action to take the heat off faculty research. Until last November, CODE was reported to be a one-man operation, obviously an Uncle Tom's cabin boy. Of course, a one-man operation has its advantages, you don't need facts. As the leader, you make up facts you need, recruit some concerned, unenlightened, students and protest.

Naturally, such a group picketed Dow Chemical. But that was a diversion to take the heat off the professor who was dropping the equivalent of Napalm on the students in his classes. It was reported that the professor himself even joined the picket line, that's really clever planning.

CODE finally confessed, however, that they had been looking for the bad in everything. Now with their new policy, they look for the worst. The last rally they organized was to protest a robin pulling up a worm. An alert biology student pointed out the absence of worms in January, but he was shouted down. Our reporter never did determine whether CODE was for the worm or the robin.

Q. How much voice should students have in prescribing the curriculum?

A. Some faculty think the students ought to sit on the committees that decide on the curriculum. In other words, they believe the students ought to decide what courses a university is going to have and what courses are relative. Of course, this position makes these faculty very popular.

It would certainly be appropriate for informed students to contribute their ideas to a curriculum discussion, but taking this statement literally is ridiculous. How could a freshman chemistry major possibly know what chemistry courses he should study? Naturally, he expects a faculty

of professionals to advise him on what is proper. Some faculty say this may be the case in a science program but it is not true in other disciplines. Unfortunately, no one explains why the other disciplines cannot relate their work to the world of 1969 in the same way as the science faculty.

The Uncle Toms say the university exists for the students who go there. It seems more logical to assume that society supports higher education so their children can develop their abilities to the point where they can make meaningful contributions to the problems which face us.

Q. Is the grading system a thing of the past?

A. I think it ought to be but we still use it here. This idea of giving A,B,C,D,F is something out of the past. Teachers have been using the normal curve for grades so long that they have come to believe in it. Grading distributions are transmitted to the students creating a self-fulfilling prophecy such that the final grades approximate the predictions. A failing grade may be determined by rank order in class rather than by failure to grasp the ideas presented in the course. As a matter of fact, research shows most students can master what we have to teach if they are given enough time and the materials and methods which suit their needs. If some of the faculty were not so busy second guessing the budget for the administration, fighting important issues such as a parking fee, or so busy working on research, they might have time to worry about how best to teach.

Q. There is a place for dissent on the campus, isn't there?

A. Of course. The overwhelming number of faculty welcome different viewpoints if they are presented as they should be at a university: all the facts, logical, unemotional arguments, the elimination of personal attacks when the facts and arguments are weak, and an honest evaluation based on the arguments and facts. In other words, most faculty want the students to learn to think so they can function as valuable members of society. This is in sharp contrast to the Uncle Toms who agitate the students to achieve personal glorification or political notoriety.

The TUCSON is an aperiodic publication of the THINK Committee.

This publication is financed solely through the donations and contributions of concerned faculty and students. Anyone interested in helping further the works of TUCSON and THINK may contact the editors, H. M. Hanson and C. E. Wales.

SEMANTICS

It was reported earlier in TUCSON that the editors of the Phoenix and Guardian had not passed English II. Disregarding the Dean's misleading statement that their previous work would not be held against them by the faculty, this reporter unearthed the fact that the editors had also not enrolled in Semantics I. Instead, they had created a run on the bookstore for the latest and most up-to-date item to be found on an editor's desk. It has been stated by reliable authority that this run has caused some logistical problems of supply and to partially alleviate this situation, the following are given:

MEDIOCRACY-undefined. Definition by context??

MEDIOCRITY-the quality or state of being mediocre.

PARTISON-undefined. Definition by context??

PARTISAN-one that takes the part of another.

APERIODIC-of irregular occurrence.

PERIODIC-occurring at regular intervals.

CENSOR-to subject to censorship.

CENSURE-a judgement involving condemnation.

FACULTY AWARDS

The editors of TUCSON are deeply grateful to the editors of Phoenix for presenting us with a well-deserved Nuremburg Award for "following the orders of our conscience" in an honest publication which carries our names.

HOUSE IN THE WOODS?

The campus has long been curious to know why the Guest Facility and President's Home was located deep in the woods. After watching the recent version of Shakespeare's, "A Midsummer Night's Dream", we think we know. Any-one for Titania?

DATA OF THE WEEK

Sixty-one percent of those who receive the Ph.D., teach. All Ph.D.'s are required to study at least one foreign language. Most Ph.D.'s never use the language they study. Essentially, none of these Ph.D.'s study educational methods. 61% of them make a living as teachers. Strange, isn't it.

TEACHING

Work is love made visible
And if you cannot work with love
but only with distaste, it is
better that you should leave your
work and sit at the gate of the
temple and take alms of those who
work with joy.

For if you bake bread with indifference, you bake a bitter bread that feeds but half man's hunger.

And if you grudge the crushing of the grapes, your grudge distills a poison in the wine.

And if you "teach" though as angels, and love not the "teaching", you muffle man's ears to the voices of the day and the voices of the night.

Adapted from Kahlil Gibran
in The Prophet

I hope the student body will stop and consider their reasons for attending Wright State. That part of the student body which is here because it has nothing better to do cannot be expected to make any worthwhile contributions to the progress of this university. However, those of us who are here struggling for a degree want our education to be worth the money and time that we put into it. We want the university from whence our education came to be one of the best in the country. Wright State is young and not sufficiently stabilized to withstand the destructive movements which are afoot; therefore, it becomes necessary for the responsible part of the student body to rise from its apathetic buttocks and take an active part in the future of Wright State. I invite anyone who is interested in the betterment of this academic community and who would be interested in forming an organization for this purpose to contact me by leaving a message in Student Activities, Room 152, Allyn Hall.

D.A. Vickers

UNION SUIT

This space was made available in this issue for any comments the Union wished to make. Unfortunately, we did not receive any material before we went to press. The TUCSON will continue to offer this space to administration critics who have something meaningful to say. Note that only half the usual space is available - we believe this suits the accuracy we expect in this space.

T
H
I
N
K